

**REMARKS**

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed September 29, 2004. Claims 1, 29, 46, 47 and 56-108 are pending in the application. Applicants have added new claim 58-108 and canceled claims 2-28, 30-45, and 48-55. New claim 58-108 correspond to canceled claim 2-28, 30-45 and 48-55. Specifically canceled claims 2-28 are now claims 59-85, canceled claims 30-45 are now claims 93-108, canceled claims 48 is now claim 58, and canceled claims 49-53 are now claims 86-90. Independent claims 1, 29, 46, and 47 are allowed in the case. Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance.

**A. Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to the amendment filed August 17, 2004 because the amendment resulted in improper claim numbering, where original claims were made dependent on newly added claims. As requested by the Examiner, the Applicants have renumbered the claims as indicated above. The Examiner has requested that the Applicants provide support for the amendment of August 17, 2004. The Examiner is pointed to the claims as originally filed in the application as an example of support for the amended claims and newly added claims. The Examiner's objection is believed to be overcome, and thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**B. Claim Rejection under 35 USC 101**

The Examiner rejected claims 48, 2-28, 49-51, 52-55, 30-45, 56 and 57 under 35 USC 101 because the invention claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicants have amended claim 48 (now claim 58), claim 52 ( now claim 89), claim 56 and claim 57 to include limitations directed to the production of useful, concrete and tangible results. The Examiner's rejection is believed to be overcome, and thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

C. Claim Rejection under 35 USC 112

The Examiner rejected claims 2-28, 30-45 and 48-57 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Applicants have renumbered the claims and addressed issues related to the lack of antecedent basis. The Applicants believe that the rejection is overcome, and thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions about this Amendment and to facilitate prosecution, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 referencing 19111.0042.

Respectfully submitted,

Swidler Berlin LLP

Dated: March 28, 2005

By: 

Chadwick A. Jackson  
Registration No. 46,495

SWIDLER BERLIN LLP  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20007  
(202) 424-7500